

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants thank the Examiner for his careful review of this application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendment and the following remarks submitted in support thereof.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102:

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 6, 9, 14, 17, 22, 27, 36-39, 46, 48-51, 53, 54, 55, and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being anticipated by US Pat. 5,596,702 to Stucka et al. (Stucka). The rejection is respectfully traversed. The teachings of Stucka do not disclose the currently claimed invention of independent claim 1. Independent claim 1 discloses a method for supplanting an X-Window dialog box. The method includes interposing a functionality between a graphical interface of an application and an Xt library layered on top of an X-window system. The original function call from the graphical interface for displaying a Motif dialog box from the X-Window system, is intercepted. A determination is then made as to whether the Motif dialog box should be supplanted and the Motif dialog box is supplanted in accordance with the determination. Supplanting the Motif dialog box further includes modifying at least one parameter in the intercepted function call. The display of the Motif dialog box with the modified parameter is recalled and the modified Motif dialog box is then displayed.

The interposed function of the present invention helps to determine whether the dialog box is to be supplanted by modifying the dialog box. The interposed function intelligently modifies a parameter in the intercepted function call and issues a modified function call to the Xt library to display another or a modified dialog box with the modified parameters. This

way the modified dialog box instead of the original dialog box requested by the application is displayed.

In contrast, Stucka teaches a method for the dynamic sharing of user interfaces and portions of user interfaces. In support of the obviousness rejection, the Examiner noted that Stucka teaches a method for supplanting a Motif dialog box. In fact, the portion relied on by the Examiner teaches developing graphical user interfaces (GUI) that support device independence by separating the interactions with the display, keyboard and mouse from the rest of the system. Furthermore, Stucka includes a user interface server interface that allows applications to access functions and data contained in a user interface server (Column 7, lines 46-50). The user interface server, loads separate copies of each shared interface into the working memory area for each application currently using the shared interface. The user interface server interface of Stucka provides a set of commands that permits each application to individually control the behavior of their user interfaces and receive information from the user interface server. Each application can issue any of the set of commands to be carried out by the user interface server (Column 8, lines 60-66). In Stucka the user interface server interface is part of the application and the application controls and modify the user interfaces. (column 8, lines 64-65). Therefore, in Stucka dialog box displayed is the same as the one requested by the application. Also, in Stucka, the user interfaces and portions of user interfaces are shared among different applications. is teaching a way of sharing of user interfaces and portions of user interfaces by different application. Whereas, the claimed invention provides a way for supplanting the display of an X-Window dialog box. The claimed invention does not require the user to pre-select menu items before accessing, as the modified Motif dialog box is the first display provided to the user after intercepting and modifying.

Furthermore, there is nothing in Stucka that discloses intercepting a function call for a dialog box from an application and supplanting the dialog box. Nevertheless, the Examiner asserts that stucka includes an intercepting function call from the graphical interface of a display or a Motif dialog box from the X-window system. Applicant respectfully traverses Examiner's characterization of Stucka because the portions of the reference relied upon by the Examiner (Col 9, lines 13-17 and Col 23, lines 38-45) do not teach the intercepting function call for a dialog box from an application program. In fact, according to Stucka the user interface server interface provides a mechanism for each application to receive appropriate information about the user actions. Furthermore, Stucka states that if an application A currently has displayed a user interface that contains a list of menu items and if a user selects a menu item shown on the display means, the appropriate function in application for handling this section would be invoked in response to the user selection (column 9, lines 14-20). All that Stucka is teaching here is that the user may select from a menu to invoke desired functions. Stucka is clearly not inferring to intercept a graphical interface for a display of a Motif dialog box from the X-window and certainly does not suggest modifying at least one parameter in the intercepted function as in the claimed invention.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations (see MPEP2143). As can be seen from above, Stucka does not teach all the features of the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claim 1. Claim 6 ultimately depend from claim 1 is likewise patentable.

In view of the reasons set forth above, independent claims 9, 17, 27, 36 and 48 are all patentable under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) for the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicant

respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claim 9, 17, 27, 36, and 48. Similarly claim 14 ultimately depends from claim 9 is patentable. Likewise, claim 22 depends from claim 17 is patentable for the reasons set forth above. In the same way, claim 32 depends from claim 32 is also patentable. Claims 37-39, 41-43, 46, and 47 depend from claim 36 are patentable for the reasons set forth above.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 3, 10, 11, 18, 19, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Stucka in view of U.S. patent No. 6,118,446 in view of Jones et al. (Jones). The Examiner correctly points out that Stucka does not teach the method wherein intercepting the function call includes calling the interposed function corresponding to an original function. Firstly, there is nothing in Jones that will cure the deficiencies that was pointed out above with respect to Stucka. As claims 2, 3, 10, 11, 18, 19, 28, and 29 depend from the independent claims discussed above, these claims are patentable under U.S.C. § 103 (a).

Moreover, Jones is directed to a computer method that allows C++ classes based on any particular class library to be generated from standard User Interface Language (UIL) file generated by a variety of GUI builders. The GUI builder may then be used as a tool to facilitate creation of classes that are inherently graphical while leaving the programmer free to deal with the inherently non-graphical bulk of the program. (abstract). Thus, there is no motivation to combine Stucka with Jones. Further, Stucka in combination with Jones still does not disclose each limitation of the independent claims in the claimed invention.

Claims 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 23, 30, 33, 44, and 56 are rejected under U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Stucka in view of U.S. Patent 5,600,789 to Parker et al. (Parker).


The Examiner correctly points out that Stucka does not teach a method where the process of determining whether the Motif dialog box is to be supplanted includes: calling a naming function to identify the Motif dialog box in the intercepted call; and comparing the name returned by the naming function against a plurality of Motif dialog box names that are to be supplanted. There is nothing in Parker that would cure the deficiencies pointed out above with respect to Stucka. As claims 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 23, 30, 33, 44 and 56 depend from the independent claims discussed above, these claims are patentable under U.S.C. § 103 (a). Moreover, Parker teaches a method for automated testing of both new and revised computer application programs, which use a graphical user interface (GUI). Simulated user events are automatically input into the GUI interface. The GUI is then monitored to observe the changes to the GUI in response to the input. In Parker, the test tools are used to ensure that the window would appear exactly same as would be provided by an application. As a matter of fact, Parker actually teaches away from modifying the dialog box. Thus, there is no motivation to combine Stucka with Parker. Further, Stucka in combination with Parker still does not disclose each limitation of the independent claims in the claimed invention. Even assuming that the Examiner's assertion that test tool can make direct function calls to the GUI in order to retrieve information, still Parker does not teach comparing the name returned by the naming function against a plurality of Motif dialog box names that are to be supplanted as claimed. Therefore, claims 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 23, 30, 33, 44, and 56 are patentable under U.S.C. § 103 (a). For the same reasons discussed above, claim 26 is patentable.

Claims 40 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Stucka in view of John Kacur (Red Hat Motif 2.1 Linux, www.linuxjournal.com, May 01, 1999) (Kacur). For the reasons described above, Stucka whether alone or in combination with Kacur still does not disclose each limitation of the independent claims in the claimed invention.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that all the pending claims 1-4, 6, 8-12, 14, 16-20, 22, 23, 25-30, 32, 33, 36-44, 46, 48-56 and 58 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 749-6900 Ext. 6926. If any additional fees are due in connection with filing this Amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. SUNMP605). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE & PENILLA, L.L.P.


Jaya Nair, Esq.
Reg. No. 46,454

Martine & Penilla, LLP
710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 170
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Telephone: (408) 749-6900
Customer Number 32291